

Appl. No.: 10/075,150
Response dated September 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action mailed July 12, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and the remarks are responsive to that office action. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veschi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,923,655) in view of Yano et al. (U.S. Patent 6,807,235).

The Response to Arguments section of the final office action mailed July 12, 2005, states that "Yano teaches a parameter (e.g., within DPCCCH, see FIG. 5) is received which allows the receiver to enter a reduced power-consumption state for a duration (e.g., see col. 5, line 57 - col. 6, line 14; and col. 6, lines 38-59) between a current burst of packets (e.g., DPDCH in a first slot of a frame) and a subsequent burst of packets (e.g., DPDCH in a subsequent slot). Veschi and Yano, however, do not support a proper prima facie case of obviousness of claim 1 because Veschi and Yano, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest "an encapsulator ... that forms at least one packet header for a current packet of a current burst of packets, ... wherein the at least one packet header contains ... a time-slice parameter specifying a relationship between the current packet of the current burst of packets and a subsequent burst of packets ... thereby allowing a digital-video-broadcast receiver to enter a reduced power-consumption state for a duration, which is based at least in part on the time-slice parameter, between receiving the current burst of packets and receiving the subsequent burst of packets."

Claim 1 recites a time-slicing digital video broadcasting transmitter system comprising: an encapsulator that forms at least one packet header for a current packet of a current burst of packets, wherein the at least one packet header contains a time-slice parameter specifying a relationship between the current packet of the current burst of packets and a subsequent burst of packets thereby allowing a digital-video-broadcast receiver to enter a reduced power-consumption state for a duration, which is based on the time-slice parameter, between receiving the current burst of packets and receiving the subsequent burst of packets.

Veschi and Yano do not teach or suggest the time-slice parameter of claim 1 as described above. On pages 2 and 4, the office action states that "Yano ... teaches a parameter (e.g., within

Appl. No.: 10/075,150
Response dated September 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

DPCCH, see FIG. 5) received allows the receiver to enter a reduced power-consumption state for a duration (e.g., see col. 5, line 57 - col. 6, line 14; and col. 6, lines 38-59) between a current burst of packets (e.g., DPDCH data in a first slot of a frame) and a subsequent burst of packets (e.g., DPDCH data in a subsequent slot)."

Yano discloses a system in which a portion of the receiver is always on checking for the presence of control information and data information. This checking occurs at the beginning of each frame of packets. Based on a change in the presence or absence of control and/or data information at the beginning of each frame of packets, signal-processing components of the receiver either enter or exit power-saving mode.

"DPCCH" refers to control information. (Yano, col. 1, lines 64-67) But DPCCH does not include any type of time-slice parameter whatsoever. A transition from the presence of DPCCH (i.e., control information) and/or DPDCH (i.e., data information) to the absence of DPCCH and/or DPDCH from the received signal is what causes the system disclosed by Yano to enter a reduced power-consumption state. A corresponding transition from the absence to the presence of DPCCH and/or DPDCH causes the system disclosed by Yano to exit the reduced power-consumption state.

As such, Yano does not teach a time-slice parameter that is within a packet header of a current packet of a current burst of packets and that specifies a relationship between the current packet of the current burst of packets and a subsequent burst of packets thereby allowing a digital-video-broadcast receiver to enter a reduced power-consumption state for a duration, which is based on the time-slice parameter, between receiving the current burst of packets and receiving the subsequent burst of packets.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with virtually the entire Response to Argue its section of the Office Action. In pertinent part, that section characterizes applicant's remarks, which appear at pages 11-13 of the Amendment filed May 16, 2005, as setting forth an interpretation in which a "time based parameter" is not received between current and subsequent bursts of packets. Applicant respectfully disagrees with that characterization.

Claim 1 recites that the receiver enters the reduced power-consumption state between receiving the current burst of packets and receiving the subsequent burst of packets, and the

Appl. No.: 10/075,150
Response dated September 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

duration of the reduced power-consumption is based on the time-slice parameter which is contained in the current packet's header. As discussed in more detail above, Veschi and Yano, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a time-slice parameter that is contained in the current packet's header and that specifies a relationship between the current packet of the current burst of packets and a subsequent burst of packets thereby allowing a digital-video-broadcast receiver to enter a reduced power-consumption state for a duration, which is based on the time-slice parameter, between receiving the current burst of packets and receiving the subsequent burst of packets.

The invention as recited in claim 1 provides a significant functional advantage over the combination of Veschi and Yano proposed in the office action. During any period between transmission of bursts of packets, the combination of Veschi and Yano proposed in the Office Action would need to continuously receive and monitor any received data to determine when the transmitter has started transmitting the subsequent burst of packets. The invention recited in claim 1 specifies in the current packet's header a relationship between the current packet of the current burst of packets and a subsequent burst of packets thereby allowing a digital-video-broadcast receiver to enter a reduced power-consumption state for a duration, which is based on the time-slice parameter, between receiving the current burst of packets and receiving the subsequent burst of packets. Therefore, unlike the proposed combination of Veschi and Yano, the invention of claim 1 does not require a receiver to receive data and monitor the received data between receiving the current and subsequent bursts of packets in order to determine when transmission of the subsequent burst of packets has begun.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that Veschi and Yano, either alone or in combination, fail to establish prima facie obviousness of claim 1 which is, therefore, in condition for allowance.

Claims 14, 24, 30, and 38 contain limitations that are analogous to the limitations discussed above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that claims 12, 24, 30, and 38 are allowable.

Appl. No.: 10/075,150
Response dated September 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

Claims 2, 4, 8-13, 15-19, 20-23, 25-29, 31-33, 35-37, 39-42, 44-47, and 48-51 properly depend upon one of the independent claims discussed above. These dependent claims are, therefore, in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above in connection with the independent claims upon which these dependent claims depend.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.


All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: September 12, 2005

By:


William J. Klein
Registration No. 43,719

10 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 463-5000
Fax: (312) 463-5001

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Page 14 of 14